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An image travelling across Europe. The transformation of “The school in an uproar” into “Le désordre dans l’école” (1809-1850)

María del Mar del Pozo Andrés & Sjaak Braster

Travelling images across Europe in the post-revolutionary period

The world of the engraving underwent radical changes at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries. The most visible and important changes had to do with new printing techniques, which made it possible to produce a virtually unlimited number of copies of an image. The engraving was now a phenomenon “née du principe de sa reproductibilité ‘presque à l’infini’”, or, in the aesthetic parlance of Walter Benjamin “exposabilité”.

The technical advances of the era included the introduction of steel plates, which allowed for many more reproductions than the copper plates had, and the engraving technique called “mezzotint”, which allowed engravers to work with tones rather than just lines, enabling them to translate pictorial effects such as light, shadow, texture, gesture and movement to the print. Despite its advantages, it took some time before the mezzotint technique came to be accepted by artists; while its invention can be traced back to the German-Dutch engraver Ludwig von Siegen, who began using it around 1640, it would not become “the major reproductive technique in England” until the end of the 18th century, its popularity possibly owing to the fact that it “became a popular vehicle for the news of the day”.

Even in “the early days of steel mezzotints, an edition of 1.200 good impressions was possible, and as techniques improved, larger plates could be engraved, many of which decorated the walls of middle-class Victorian houses”.

This last phrase offers a window into the reception and use of engravings at the time. Print culture scholars have generally tended to approach their investigations from the perspective of print technology and its impact on the world of printing. But those aspects relating to “users”, i.e., how and why the gravures and etchings were employed, has been much less studied.

An approximation to this new perspective brings us to another important transformation that took place at the turn of the 18th century, one of an economic and social nature. The middle class began to show a much greater interest in art, fashion and daily life, and this phenomenon affected all of Europe. In Great Britain, engravings ceased to be the exclusive patrimony of wealthy collectors, finding a place beyond the very private salons where albums were perused under the light of an oil lamp. They became a visual means of communication, and the new consumer society began to crave constant novelties that would depict the time’s political and social goings-on. This new clientele wished to purchase prints to hang on the walls of their dining rooms and living rooms, prints by the most famous artists, prints showing the most popular heroes and the latest
fashions. In post-revolutionary France, the engraving became an "instrument idéologique" and a "miroir de l'histoire", but also the means for satisfying the insatiable curiosity "des citoyens de toutes classes, avides de connaître les moindres incidents de la vie nationale". Many countries experienced a similar trend; numerous print shops showed in their display windows and store fronts portraits and caricatures of the heroes and villains of the time, while people gathered around and gawked at the offerings in a scene that conformed a part of the day's modern life and urban culture. At the same time, a new type of middle class clientele was emerging, one that could afford to buy its favourite engravings and prints to decorate their salons with. In any case, these prints were becoming more and more affordable, thanks to reductions in the cost of printing. In fact, around the year 1800, and all over Europe, it was not unusual for well-established professionals, with wealth enough to buy an urban villa or a small country estate, to build a "cabinet" or "print room" in the 18th-century English style, which was essentially a room especially designed for showing their collections of prints, which would reflect their cultural and social interests. Prints became an especially effective means for the circulation of ideas as well, as they could defy strictly defined national spaces and cross borders.

This border-crossing was especially visible between France and Great Britain. The 18th century had already witnessed a fluid interchange of images between these two countries, although this communication had been interrupted by the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars (1789-1815), a circumstance that had a very negative impact on the print market in Britain in the first three decades of the 19th century. With the reestablishment of peace and the free circulation of goods, some very specialized publishers, such as Rudolf Ackermann, made an attempt at introducing themselves into the French print market with luxury products, offering limited series of expensive, hand-coloured mezzotints that reproduced the best-known works of the more famous English painters, in editions that did not exceed a thousand copies. Most English publishers, however, chose to address the demand of their new clientele, interested in buying inexpensive prints on everyday subjects to hang on their walls. This led them to print large numbers of copies of engravings that could be considered a priori to potentially be popular in both countries. The fact that many of these prints were made with the express idea of being sold abroad is attested to by the bilingual caption – in English and French – and the translation of the original title, which was considered an "indicateur de diffusion".

In a diary entry from 15 September 1797, the German poet Johann Wolfgang von Goethe laments the ever-increasing technical possibilities for mechanically reproducing works of art, which had led ambitious entrepreneurs to satisfy a growing demand for prints by hiring artists and engravers to imitate and copy original art works. With this observation, Goethe was portending what would be one of the great conundrums for the art world at the turn of the century, which had to do with whether the traditional definition of a "printed image" could be applied to an engraving printed a thousand times, and with the im-
plicit questions regarding such a work’s authorship. Engravers had traditionally filled a role copying, imitating and reproducing as faithfully as possible an original painting, “a replica, as exact as possible”. The 18th century even saw the elaboration of a theory that established a parallelism between the work of an engraver and that of a translator; the engraver, then, was meant to interpret the painter’s work, acting as an intermediary. With the widespread use of the new printing techniques at the beginning of the 19th century, there were often several engravers involved in copying a work, leading to a multiplicity of interpretations of a painting. As a result, different prints represented different readings of the original work, each one as legitimate as the next. These different receptions and adaptations defied traditional frameworks even further when the engraver was from a different country than the artist, adding yet another modification to the reading of the reproduction, one depending on the cultural context of its origin. This is the case of the engraving “The School in an Uproar”, which could be considered a paradigmatic example of intercultural history.

In this article we intend to advance one step further in the analysis of one of the most emblematic and popular images of the European school in the 19th century. The multiple versions of this work that were produced in Great Britain and the changes and adaptations that it underwent in crossing borders and being absorbed into other national contexts make it a fascinating case for studying the phenomena surrounding cultural transfer of the concept of school. In the following pages we will attempt to answer two questions relating to the contexts of reception, appropriation and reinterpretation of this iconographic object:

1. What transformations did “The School in an Uproar” undergo in evolving from a unique work to a print that was reproduced thousands of times? What visible reinterpretations were practiced on the original work by engravers/translators?

2. What changes did “The School in an Uproar” undergo in being transformed into “Le Vacarme dans l’École”, i.e., in its journey from Great Britain to France? How did the processes of circulation operate between these two countries?

“The School in an Uproar”: The iconic image of education in the 19th century

In the spring of 1809 a watercolour titled “Picture of Youth” was displayed in a London art gallery. The enthusiasm it garnered from public and critics alike had less to do with its artistic merit than with the subject chosen for the work. The scene shown depicted “a country school” where the children, left to their own devices by the absent teacher, are simply having fun; “and surely never before was a picture so replete with those incidents of infantile fun and frolic upon which imagination dwells, as it looks back with fond regret”. The reason for the picture’s popularity lay in its ability to conjure up in viewers’ collective memory the by-gone days of school, including what must have been a fairly common circumstance, the unexpected arrival of the teacher who finds “his
class having a rollicking, full-fledged party, with mirth and ridicule of the teacher included".10

The author of this watercolour, James Henry Richter, (1772 – 1857) was not one of the most famous painters of his generation, which was dominated by figures such as William Turner, David Wilkie and John Constable; and yet he succeeded in making a place for himself in the artistic scene of London thanks to the subjects of his compositions, which gained him a reputation for his “strange mixture of extravagance and genius”.11 His colleagues remarked of Richter that he “possesses a degree of tact in the choice of his subjects, which renders him secure of a hit whenever he chooses to attempt one”.12 In general, Richter painted scenes from daily life that the middle class found delightful and perfect for hanging on their walls.

The watercolour “Picture of Youth” was immediately acquired by William Chamberlayne (1760 - 1829), MP for Southampton, art collector and patron of Richter; who would in fact end up owning most of Richter’s well-known works. As a result of this purchase, the watercolour in question would rarely ever be shown again for public viewing.

From the moment of its initial viewing in 1809, there was a considerable clamour for the work to be made into a print, this being an unquestionable indication of its success. But as it belonged to Chamberlayne, Richter’s patron and benefactor, who had acquired it as a unique and exclusive art work, any reproduction would require his approval. When in May of 1822 Richter published a portfolio titled Illustrations of the Works of Henry Richter. First Series, the artist made quite clear that this work was an “invention of the Original Picture in his possession”, “that is, a variation of the picture from 1809, but with a series of novel details that connected it more closely to the year 1822”.13 The portfolio contained five numbered prints without captions, although with a new title for the collection, “A Picture of Youth, or The School in an Uproar”. Print Number 1 consisted “of a small vignette frontispiece of the original in the possession of Wm. Chamberlayne”.14 The other four prints showed enlargements, carried out by means of a rather original zoom technique, of specific scenes taken from the initial drawing. The size of the original drawing was quite small, making it hard to appreciate the finer details, a fact that would seem to attest to Chamberlayne’s reticence to have other copies of his work circulating about. The enlarged scenes were made as lithographs, engraved by Richter himself. This was a rather unusual procedure. It gives an idea of his concern with controlling the authenticity and originality of his creation. But such effort was for naught; at least two of his scenes would be pirated without his permission on numerous occasions in the following decade. Richter’s image of the school obviously continued to have great appeal, and calls continued to be made for the reproduction of the original watercolour in its entirety, as “the whole, and nothing but the whole, of this excellent composition, can do justice to the talents of the artist”.15 The same anonymous reviewer put in words the remarkable sympathy of the public for this image of the school which “has lived in our memory since
the first appearance" in 1809; "the subject is so intimately connected with our early associations", "and such were its attractions, and so strong the impression it made upon us, that it has been our theme of regret ever since that a print [...] had not been given to the public".  

We can see therefore that it was a new type of consumer, anxious to acquire any sort of novelty or entertainment that was demanding a large-scale edition of this scene representing the school memories of a particular generation of British men. The economic success of the operation was such a sure thing that Chamberlayne and Richter had no choice but to reach some sort of an agreement. In April 1823, the painter exhibited a new watercolour under the title "A Picture of Youth; or, the School in an Uproar, a second picture on the subject", presenting it as a copy of the original in possession of Chamberlayne and specifying that it "has been made for the express purpose of its being engraved". Richter's insistence on making this point absolutely clear can be attributed to the context in which he found himself, utterly immersed in the culture of reproduction. In describing his new work as a "copy" he meant to say that it was a faithful replication, made by himself, of his first watercolour. However, we believe it to be much more likely that Richter made not just one but several versions of his work, the so-called repetitions, defined as "a painter's different, yet closely related, versions of a specific composition". In any case, only one single reproduction of this picture has been published, courtesy of Sotheby. And yet, several international auction houses have shown on Internet different copies of the work in the last two decades. Some of the renditions are watercolours, others oil-on-canvas. They are all attributed to Richter and in most cases they are signed by him as well.

In the spring of 1825 Richter presented for the Water-Colour Exhibition a new work with an educational theme, "The School in Repose", which portrayed a classroom of girls. During the same month, both pictures, "The School in an Uproar" and "The School in Repose", were shown together in Leeds, at an exhibit of living artists. The works were presented as a pair, the second one being considered "an excellent companion" to the first. Here Richter's commercial instinct is on display; consumers often preferred to buy pairs of prints, as they proved easier to decorate walls with than single works. From our cultural and social context, it is easy for us to assume that the parallelism of the prints stems from their representing one schoolroom of boys and one of girls, i.e., that gender is the category that links the two. However, viewers of the time seem to have shared a sensorial category linked to their collective memory. For them, "The School in an Uproar" represented confusion and noise, while in "The School in Repose" the girls' mischievous acts "are all executed in silence".

On April 11, 1825 a mezzotint engraving of Richter's watercolour appeared with a slightly modified title "The Village School in an Uproar". Beneath the title, written in thick and thin script, we are informed that the print is a reproduction "from the Original Picture in the possession of Wm Chamberlayne Esq M.P.". This curious annotation leads us to suspect that it was the watercolour
from 1809, and not the one made in 1823, that served as a model for this engraving. This sort of uncertainty seems to have been fairly common in the print culture of the 19th century, when it was "frequently unclear which piece served as the original for a reproduction, for this role was apparently played on occasion by a group of works".21

The engraver of the work, Charles Turner (1774-1857), was one of the most well-known artists in his field, figuring as "Mezzotint Engraver in Ordinary to his Majesty" and having been designated, in 1828, "Associate Engraver of the Royal Academy of Arts".22 His fame derived from his use of his own printing technique, which incorporated the latest advances of the era, and his skill at combining, on his mezzotint plates, the inks that most faithfully reproduced the play of light and shadow so inherent to paintings. In fact, he became specialized in producing engravings of portraits of well-known figures of the time, owing to his ability to transmit expressions and emotions through the skilful use of tone and chiaroscuro effects. Such talent made Turner the perfect choice for "translating" into a print format the rich range of emotions that abounded in Richter's watercolour. Judging from the critiques, he did a consummate job, with the specialized press praising his excellence as a "translator" of the original work: "all the delicacy, force, and general manner of the original are happily preserved",23 "the unbroken circle of mischief is kept up", "and the character of the countenances and uproar is very happily multiplied by these impressions from a sister Art".24 However, when the work "intended as a companion" of "The School in an Uproar", "The School in Repose" was published in mezzotint print form by a much lesser-known artist, J. Arnold, the press was harsh in its criticism: "the engraver has not done justice to Mr. Richter's work. It is a failure, although sufficient of humour and character remains to procure for it an extensive sale among those who possess the print with which it is meant to be associated, and which was one of the most popular of modern publications".25

What visible reinterpretations of Richter's original work were made by the engraver Charles Turner? We have made a comparison of one of the editions of Turner's engraving (Colnaghi & Puckle, 1841) with the two versions of "The School in an Uproar" authenticated as having been done by Richter, i.e., the portfolio (1822) and the watercolour reproduced in his book by Solkin and dated 1823. We can perceive the great care taken by Turner in faithfully reproducing the expressions and movements of all of the characters - children and teacher - which represented a considerable challenge in an epoch when "Georgians as well as Victorians became 'literate' in physiognomy, interpreting the character and personality of their fellow citizens through the observation of their bodies".26 And it was precisely this aspect that was most valued by viewers. However, Turner chose to leave out a series of basic elements that had served to provide a historical context to the work. For instance, he refrained from reproducing any of the iconotexts and messages that appeared on the books and notebooks, such as "Zeno loved Silence" or "England expects every man to do his duty".27 We suspect that there were two reasons for these omis-
sions. First, to confer a more a-temporal nature to the print, thus ensuring that it could continue to be reproduced over time. Secondly, to make it more accessible to the middle classes, who very possibly may not have understood the ironic reference to the philosopher Zeno of Elea.

There are at least three other differences that would seem to be the result of a collaboration between painter and engraver. In several of the prints from the Richter portfolio (1822) we can observe circle dots, in what may constitute a Masonic reference, that in the 1823 watercolour seem to have disappeared and in Turner’s engraving are invisible. Richter himself modified the landscape that is visible through the classroom window; where there was a church tower in the 1822 engraving, we find a country house in the watercolour from 1823, possibly a way of accentuating the character of the village school that the scene was meant to depict. Turner took special care with this detail of the countryside, making it into a miniature landscape somewhat in the style of the magnificent ones painted so impressively by the great painter who shared his surname, William Turner. But the most significant change to be found is in the representation of a popular game called hangman or gallows, which is so painstakingly depicted on the wall in the print by Richter (1822) that we can even read the name of the “hanged” person, Goggins. This is an obvious reference to Thomas Goggins, an Irishman accused of being a Fenian extremist and executed in this same year and by this same method in Cork. In Richter’s watercolour from 1823 we can barely make out the shadow of a hanged man, while in the engraving by Turner it is practically invisible and totally unrecognizable (if one is not familiar with the 1822 portfolio). These variations can be interpreted as a way of de-personalizing the print and eliminating the most characteristic elements of its biography, a way of converting the scene into a modal object, in line with the semiotic meaning given by Greimas, i.e., as the central element in the relationship between emitter and receiver. In other words, through these subtle changes, a work of art designed by its author to be comprehended by a specific, educated British elite was now a modal object, ready for consumption by a much wider audience. This is what helped consecrate “The School in an Uproar” as the 19th century’s iconic image of education.

The French versions of “The School in an Uproar”

In July 1825 the specialized French press gave notice of the publication of a new print, “Le vacarme dans l’école” (Picture 1), “aqua-tinta d’après Richter”. This brief notice served to announce that “The School in an Uproar” had crossed the English Channel. The engraver and publisher of the work was Jean Pierre Marie Jazet (1788 - 1871), one of the great French masters in the use of aquatint. This was the most historically important printing process after mezzotint and the one capable of producing visual effects that most resembled those of watercolour wash. Normally it was used together with etching outline, which makes
us suspect that the engraving technique used by Jazet in France must have been very similar to the one used by Turner in Great Britain. While we cannot know exactly how the printing was done, we believe that Jazet likely had before him several models of Richter's original work. In other words, he must have worked with one of the watercolours, probably the one from 1823, assuming that for his engraving Turner used the original work from 1809; but Jazet almost certainly would also have consulted the portfolio from 1822 with the five prints.

As an engraver, Jazet was specialized in scenes from the life of Napoleon Bonaparte, in famous painters such as Jean-Louis David, and in portraits of French "national glories". This gives added interest to the analysis of how he translated Richter's work into French. For the most part, the children's and teacher's faces maintain similar gestures and positions, although certain lines seem to have been softened and hair darkened. But there are at least three details in which we can observe an attempt at "de-Briticising" the print. First, in one of the copybooks thrown on the floor that contains numbers and amounts, we can read the heading soustraction, which is the French translation of the word subtraction, which was clearly legible in the 1822 portfolio. Secondly, Jazet does away with the effigy of Thomas Dilworth that was perfectly recognizable in one of the spelling books in Richter's works. There is nothing surprising about this, given that this famous English 18th century schoolmaster meant nothing to the French audience. And finally, the barely-visible outlines of the hangman game from Richter's 1823 watercolour are outlined more strongly by Jazet. We do not know if the jeu du pendu, the French version of this English game, was already popular at this time or if Jazet meant to evoke in his observers images of the French
Revolution. These slight modifications allow us to conclude that Jazet based his reproductions on more than one model and that one of his inspirations was almost certainly the portfolio produced by Richter in 1822, as these were the only images in which some of these details can be observed.

If the print “The School in an Uproar” was taken to France with such celebrity, it was with the hope that its success, both in popularity and sales, might replicate that of Great Britain. And successful it was. In November 1825 another very well-known French engraver, Philibert Louis Debucourt, produced a work titled “L’école en désordre”, “d’après H. Richeter [sic]”. This is the first version of the work that varies ostensibly from the English original, most noticeably in the simplified and inexpressive way that the children are rendered. Although Debucourt knew of the existence of Jazet’s engraving, he went ahead and published a twin for the print, leading us to surmise that the French public shared the English predilection for hanging pairs of prints of a same theme on the walls of their bourgeois homes. The accompanying work that Debucourt himself drew and engraved for this purpose was “La Récréation”. The subject must have been very popular indeed; a month later, in December 1825 we find announced the publication of another print, “L’Ordre rétabli dans l’école”, that is also clearly meant to accompany “Le vacarme dans l’école” (Picture 2). In this case it was an aquatint drawn by Charles-Nicolas Lemercier (1797-1859) and engraved by Esbrard. The subject itself was much more novel than the girls’ school depicted by Debucourt, showing us instead the scene from “the School in an Uproar” a minute after the teacher’s entrance. Many of the iconographic elements can be read in parallel in both prints, which supports the idea that they were meant to be a matching pair. Common elements include the classroom structure, the position of the window, the costume of the boy pretending to be the teacher and the many children’s drawings on the walls. There are other elements, however, that give us a glimpse of the modernity of the French school, such as the blackboard full of geometric diagrams, the many books and the elegant teacher’s chair. Students are dressed in a clearly modern French style, one of them sporting a homemade, burlesque sort of Napoleon bicorn hat with feathers. The folly in which they are engaged is less child-like than that of their English counterparts and includes dices and card games. Both images could be considered a mirror in which the material elements of the French and English school culture are reflected as opposites.

Countless editions of all of these prints would be made in the decade to follow. In catalogues designed for the French and Spanish market and published between 1831 and 1834, the print “Le vacarme dans l’école” can be found within the supplement of “lithographies nouvelles”, and “gravé à l’aquatinta par Jazet, d’après les originaux de Wilkie et autres”. This would seem to indicate that this refers to a new edition, one in which the name and acknowledgement of Henry Richter are nowhere to be found. Although these catalogues were published in Spanish and meant to appeal to the market in Spain, we have been unable to find any evidence to indicate that the Spanish public showed any particular
interest in the print, nor have we found any copies in the principal image libraries of Madrid or Catalunya. Further editions of the prints were published, with the caption “Le désordre dans l’école” (Picture 3), but these were made by anonymous engravers different from Jazet and Debucourt. Picture 3 shows a drawing of the children that, in addition to being cruder, displays some rather unconvincing proportions. Curiously, the hangman drawn on the wall provides a contrast, showing a more detailed and elaborate human figure than the one in Richter’s portfolio rendering. The artist seems to be depicting an actual execution and not simply a game of jeu du pendu. It is possible that this anonymous engraver was weighing in on the debate over capital punishment that was taking in place in France at the time and to which Victor Hugo contributed with his work Le Dernier Jour d’un condamné (1829) and a chilling drawing titled “Le pendu” (1854). This print no longer shows the joyful chaos and childhood mischief of previous versions; even the jeu de morpion lacks the definition that makes it so easily recognizable in the other drawings; here it is simply a lonely board with empty squares.

“Le vacarme dans l’école” was also printed on decorative objects, especially on pitchers. The concept conveyed by the work was even alluded to when an unusually boisterous session of parliament erupted and was identified with “la célèbre gravure anglaise qui représente le vacarme dans l’école”, sometimes expressed directly in English, “uproar in the school”; the French public’s appropriation of the icon was not quite culminated.
The French sequel of "The School in an Uproar" as an anticipation of a new revolutionary period

In March 1847 the French publisher Jean Dopter announced the simultaneous publication of two prints clearly meant to form a pair, "Le désordre dans l'école des garçons" and "Le désordre dans l'école des filles". Neither the author nor the engraver of the prints was identified. Dopter ran a lucrative print business at the time, employing some one hundred and fifty workers. The prints were made using chromo-lithography, a recently developed technique that not only reduced printing costs enormously but allowed for the mass-production of prints. What's more, prints made with this technique looked more like hand-painted oil paintings, making them ideal pieces for decorating middle and even lower class homes. For this reason, it was important that the subjects chosen reflected the tastes of this ever-broader segment of the population.

"Le désordre dans l'école des garçons" (Picture 4) shows a scene from a school whose French origin can be perceived from the children's clothing. While the furniture has scarcely changed, there is more material, including the popular printed lesson sheets, blackboards and maps. A female teacher, shown ringing a bell frantically, is being totally ignored by her students. We can still observe the central narrative element of "The School in an Uproar", which is the unexpected arrival of the teacher, and some of the secondary themes, such as the child drawing his caricature or the fight between the two classmates. But
the print as a whole is much more violent than the original; a toy canon has been fired to torture a cat; two birds that have been freed from their cage have been set upon by a child with a rifle; several of the students are challenging each other and fighting. Although the male teacher has a whip in his hand, he seems to have no authority and commands no respect from his students. From a pedagogical perspective, this image can be seen as a criticism of the overcrowding of public schools and a portrayal of the failure of the French system of school organization, which had begun to use a network of head teachers and assistant teachers in an attempt to impose some sort of rudimentary system of children classification in the classroom. But it is the political element that is most evident in the picture, including indications of nostalgia for Napoleon as well as gestures that presage the revolutionary events of 1848. We feel, therefore, that this print qualifies as the French appropriation of the concept of “school in an uproar”.

Final remarks

Around 1850, coinciding with the prevalence of the chromo-lithograph, thousands of prints made their way around the world, satisfying the demands of a population that was increasingly avid for the printed image and dependent on visual stimuli as a way of ordering and apprehending the goings-on of daily life. Some of these prints were of a particular pictorial genre, the school scenes, and the most numerous were those belonging to this sub-genre of “the school
in an uproar", which we could describe as portraying the chaos and disorder of a classroom when the teacher was absent in the boys schools, the mischief and folly engaged in by the children in the teacher’s absence, and the punishment that was to come with his unexpected return. This sub-genre meant to keep alive the memories of the men and women’s school days, thrived throughout the entire 19th century, and was even incorporated into artistic photography in the early 20th century. What we have is an early – and very successful – discovery of the market for nostalgia.
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